



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,558	10/16/2003	Hideaki Funakoshi	04995/121001	1170

7590 08/06/2008
Jonathan P. Osha
ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P.
Suite 2800
1221McKinney St.
Houston, TX 77010

EXAMINER

ATALA, JAMIE JO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed July 8, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On pages 3-4 applicant argues that Honjo (US 5,787,225) in view of Nakajo (US 6,925,042) in further view of Proidl (US 6,961,510) in further view of Oguro (US 5,784,518) fails to disclose, suggest, or teach the following limitation "a control unit configured to control the expansion unit, when the high speed reproduction key is operated the compressed video and audio data for a number of frames corresponding to the n-fold speed, alternating with reproducing the compressed video and audio data in one of a normal speed and a two-fold speed for a predetermined number of frames" as recited in Claim 1. It is taught by Oguro in Column 1 Lines 10-32 performs A-fold high speed reproduction wherein A is an integer 2 or above. Additionally, applicant argues that the prior art of record does not show alternating between speeds; however, in Figure 14a-b shows a video stream that is being processed in varying A fold speeds. Furthermore, the alternating of reproduction speeds and frames as the video data is searched and compared will alternate speeds as disclosed in Column 2 Lines 19-47. Although, all of applicants points are understood the examiner can not agree and therefore the rejection is maintained.

/John W. Miller/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623